

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAME	DINVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
09/511,292	02/23/00	NAGASHIMA		J	H-204325	_	
Γ		QM02/0815			EXAMINER	ا	
ANTHONY LUKE SIMON GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION				ATKINSON, C ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER			
LEGAL STAFF P O BOX 331 DETROIT MI	14			3743 DATE MAILED	: 08/15/00	~	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	09/51,292		Nagashimn et al		
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Group Art Unit		
	Attinson	<u> </u>	3743		
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	s on the cover sheet b	eneath the co	rrespondence ad	idress	
Period for Reply	3 - S	MONTH(S)	FROM THE MAII	ING DATE	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			-		
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replaced in the period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu 	ply within the statutory minir	mum of thirty (30)	ays will be consider	on .	
Status				-•	
Status ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
 □ This action is FINAL. □ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193 	for formal matters, pro 5 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 2	13.	, the monte to an		
Disposition of Claims Claim(s)	is/are	is/are pending in the application.			
Claim(s)	is/are	is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
Of the above claim(s)		is/are	allowed.		
Of the above claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s)	is/are	is/are rejected.			
☑ Claim(s)———		ie/ar	objected to.		
☐ Claim(s)		oro s	ubject to restriction	n or election	
□ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		requ	irement.		
Application Papers			•		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawi	ing Review, PTO-948.	J. □ dicentro	ved		
dead drowing correction filed on	is 🗀 approve	g Ligsappio	veu.		
is/are objection	ected to by the Examine	∄.			
☐ The drawing(s) filed on					
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.					
☐ The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)					
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9	9(a)-(d).			
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen	9(a)-(d). ts have been			
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received.	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen	9(a)-(d). ts have been	a)).		
 ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nur received in this national stage application from the 	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen nber) International Bureau (P	O(a)-(d). ts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(~//·		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received.	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen nber) International Bureau (P	O(a)-(d). ts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(~//·		
The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nur □ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Δttachment(s)	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen nber) International Bureau (P	9(a)-(d). ts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(3	
The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nur □ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen nber) International Bureau (P	G(a)-(d). ts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(ummary, PTO-413		
The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nur □ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Δttachment(s)	under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9 of the priority documen mber) International Bureau (P	O(a)-(d). Its have been CT Rule 1 7.2(olication, PTO-15	

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97) Part of Paper No.

Application/Control Number: 09/511,292

Art Unit: 3743

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide clear support for the claim terminology. 37 CFR § 1.75(d)(1) requires that terms and phrases used in the claims find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. Specifically, the term heat sinking member does not appear in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 4, the recitation "the said heat sinking member" is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Paterson.

The patent of Paterson in Figures 1-3 discloses applicant's claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3743

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Paterson in view of Jackson et al. or Wolgemuth et al. The patent of Paterson discloses all the claimed features of the invention with the exception of a sealing member.

The patents of Jackson et al. or Wolgemuth et al. in Figure 2 and Figure 3 respectively, disclose that it is known to have a sealing member between a power module and a heat sinking member for the purpose of directly contacting the power module with the cooling fluid. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Paterson a sealing member between a power module and a heat sinking member for the purpose of directly contacting the power module with the cooling fluid as disclosed in Jackson

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/511,292

Art Unit: 3743

et al. or Wolgemuth et al.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wolgemuth et al. in view of Kwak. The patent of Wolgemuth et al. in Figures 1-4 discloses all the claimed features of the invention with the exception of spring clips in recesses and indentations.

The patent of Kwak in Figures 2 and 7 discloses that it is known to have C-shaped spring clips in recesses and indentations for the purpose of securing a power module to a heat sinking member. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Wolgemuth et al. C-shaped spring clips in recesses and indentations for the purpose of securing a power module to a heat sinking member as disclosed in Kwak.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Atkinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2603.

CHRISTOPHER ATKINSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 13, 2000